

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on April 14, 2003, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 5, 10, 20, 23, and 28 are amended; as a result, claims 1-42 are currently pending in this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

In the Figures

The Office Action provided that for FIG. 7 steps 720 and 740 were unclear as to there was no indication of the direction flow (Yes/No indication). Applicant has provided a replacement sheet for FIG. 7 with the present Amendment and Response. Applicant submits that no new matter is added in these amendments, and that support for these amendments can be found through out the specification, including, but not limited to, page 20, line 4 through page 21, line 27.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10-22, 24, 25, and 27

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10-22, 24, 25, and 27 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,088,652 to Abe (hereinafter "Abe") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,182,010 to Berstis (hereinafter "Berstis"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

Applicant's independent claims 1, 10, and 20, as amended, recite an electronic navigational aid device that recognizes an approaching decision point in a route and provides to a display an overlay adapted to display a preview of the decision point, where the decision point includes a highlighted portion indicating a course to follow through the decision point.

The Examiner cited Berstis to at least illustrate an overlay screen on top of a presently displayed screen. From Applicant's review, it appears Berstis provides a navigation system for a vehicle in which images or text are superimposed on or associated with the image to facilitate navigation (see the abstract). The images in Berstis appear to include still photographs of the intersection (see the abstract). Berstis, however, fails to teach or suggest a decision point that includes a highlighted

portion indicating a course to follow through the decision point, as recited in claims 1, 10, and 20.

The Examiner also cited Abe to at least illustrate an electronic navigation aid device. Abe, however, does not cure the above identified deficiencies of Berstis. As such, each and every element of independent claims 1, 10, and 20 is not taught or suggested in Abe and Berstis, either independently or in combination. Therefore, the 103 rejection should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection for the above independent claims, as well as those claims which depend therefrom, are respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 23

Claims 5 and 23 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe and Berstis as applied to the claims above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,740 to Ito, et al. (hereinafter "Ito"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

For the reasons presented above, neither Abe nor Berstis, either independently or in combination, teach or suggest the elements recited in Applicant's amended independent claims 1, 10, and 20.

The Office Action asserted that Ito suggests that "the calculated route is highlighted to provide more clearly such route (see at least figure 9B and related text)" and that it would have been "obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Ito et al. into the system of Abe in order to provide more visual the detail of the course approaching the intersection." Applicant respectfully traverses these assertions.

Ito provides that with respect to the "highlighted" portion of the figures, "FIG. 9(B) shows an example of a display map . . . around the departure point PD . . . [where] the road R1 is highlighted by markings MA, and in this way the searched route is indicated." (Col. 17, lines 10-14). "This type of display is continued until the vehicle passes out of the surrounding area of the departure point (i.e., display continues so long as a "NO" decision is made at Step S108)." (Col. 17, lines 16-19). Ito, however, fails to teach or suggest that the highlighting could be used in

association with a "decision point" or that a highlighted portion indicates a course to follow through the decision point, as recited in currently amended claims 1, 10 and 20. Thus, Ito does not cure the deficiencies of the Abe and Berstis references.

Claims 28-33 and 35-42

Claims 28-33 and 35-42 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe and Berstis as applied to the claims above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,052,645 to Harada (hereinafter " Harada"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant's independent claim 28, as amended, recite a navigation system for negotiating a decision point along a route that recognizes an approaching decision point in the route and provides to a display an overlay screen including cartographic data accurately depicting a geographic detail of the decision point with a highlighted portion indicating a course to follow through the decision point

As noted above, Abe and Berstis do not describe these aspects of the Applicant's invention.

The Examiner recited Harada to at least illustrate the use of a server and the communication between a navigation system and the server. Applicant respectfully submits that Harada, however, does not cure the above identified deficiencies of Abe and Berstis. As such, each and every element of independent claim 28 is not taught or suggested in cited documents, either independently or in combination. Therefore, the 103 rejection should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection for the above independent claims, as well as those claims which depend therefrom, are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 659-9340 to facilitate prosecution of this matter.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 501-791. **Additionally, please direct all future correspondence regarding this case to: 1200 E. 151ST ST., OLATHE, KS 66062, ATTENTION: DEVON A. ROLF, Esq.**

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS NON-FEE AMENDMENTS, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 14th day of July, 2003.

Sarah L Reinhard
Name
Sarah L Reinhard
Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
Jay Dee Krull, et al.

By their Representatives,
E.J. BROOKS & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By: Joseph C. Huebsch
Joseph C. Huebsch
Reg. No. 42,673

Date: July 14, 2003